

amendments to 1172 clarifies a little more clearly the responsibilities of some of these various committees. First of all, the Citizens Advisory Committee under the committee amendment, the program review recommendations that the Citizens Advisory Committee makes would be binding on the director. In other words, the Citizens Advisory Committee is actually one conducting program review. Under the way the bill was drafted originally, the director was only given advice by the Citizens Advisory Committee and there was some concern that a director could, in fact, ignore any of the program review recommendations and not make any recommendations at all. So the committee amendment would change that so that the program review mechanisms would be directly done by the advisory...Citizens Advisory Committee. It reinstates the Private Vocational School Authorization Act under the State Board of Education. We originally decided we were going to put all of those authorizations under one agency. There was some concern by the private vocational schools that if we did that, that it would upset some of the provisions that they have right now, so we reinstated it back to the State Board of Education. It gives the director the authority, under the committee amendment, to convene joint meetings of the Citizens Advisory Committee and the Planning Council in order to facilitate communications between the two advisory committees and, again, that was part of the intention. I would assume that any good director would have done that anyway, because, quite frankly, this whole mechanism, as I view it, is a means to provide a mechanism for communication in higher education, which I think is somewhat lacking. But we did have that issue raised as to whether or not the Citizens Advisory Committee and the Planning Council would ever talk to each other and understand what each committee or council was planning. It clarifies that the cooperative agreements with other nonhigher education institutions, such as school districts or businesses, would be authorized. And I can give you the reasoning behind that. There is a specific reason behind that because under the language that the bill was drafted, it could easily be interpreted that only cooperative programs between higher education entities would be allowed and we have a situation right now where Kearney State College is entering into a cooperative program with a school district in another state and it seemed to us that that was appropriate to amend it so that it could be other cooperative programs as well because it is good for both Kearney State College and the other school district in